

SJSU/TP-02-24
October 2002

On “Bell’s inequality without alternative settings”

J. Finkelstein¹
Department of Physics
San José State University
San José, CA 95192, U.S.A

Abstract

Cabello has recently (in quant-ph/0210081) observed that “...an EPR-experiment with a fixed POVM on each particle provides a violation of Bell’s inequality without requiring local observers to choose between the alternatives.” In this note I discuss the implications of this observation for tests of locality.

¹ Participating Guest, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
e-mail: JLFINKELSTEIN@lbl.gov

One of the difficulties for experimental tests of the Bell inequalities [1] is the implementation of the requirement of space-like separation of the choice between alternative measurements on one particle from the measurement on the other. Cabello [2] has recently suggested that this requirement is not actually necessary; in fact, he has presented a version of a Bell-violation experiment in which no such choice is ever made.

Cabello begins by discussing the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt inequality [3] which he writes as

$$|AB - Ab - aB - ab| \leq 2, \quad (1)$$

where A and a are alternative measurements which might be performed on particle 1, B and b are alternative measurements which might be performed on particle 2, and e.g. AB is the expectation value of the product of the results of A and B . It is well-known that, for suitable choice of initial two-particle state and measurement directions, quantum theory predicts a violation of this inequality. A and a cannot both be actually measured, so it is usually assumed that a choice has to be made between A and a (and similarly between B and b). Cabello's observation is that a single, fixed POV measurement on particle 1 can have the effect of a measurement of A or of a (and a single POV measurement on particle 2 the effect of a measurement of B or b), and so it would be possible to perform an experiment with fixed (POV) measurements on the two particles for which quantum theory would predict a violation of the inequality (1). Since no choice between alternative measurements would have to be made, one would certainly not have to worry about making choices so quickly that they would have space-like separation from the other measurement!

Suppose we consider, as an alternative to Cabello's suggestion, a Bell-theorem experiment with projective measurements, so that a choice between alternative settings would have to be made, but in which the choices are announced well in advance of the measurements. This would not affect the quantum predictions (given e.g. in eq. 11 of ref. 2), since those predictions do not care about when the choices are made, and so quantum theory would still predict a violation of the inequality (1). However, a verification of this prediction would not be a proof of nonlocality, since a local theory could agree with the quantum prediction by allowing the measurement results on one particle to be correlated with the setting (chosen much earlier) for the other particle. A conflict between quantum theory and locality arises if quantum theory predicts a violation of an inequality *in a case in which any local theory must satisfy that inequality*.

Ref. 2 does not offer any proof that, in the experiment proposed there, locality would require that the inequality (1) be satisfied. In fact, it is very easy to construct a local model which would exactly reproduce the quantum predictions for this experiment (as for any experiment in which no choices are made). The proposed POV measurements on each particle have four possible outcomes, so there are a total of 16 possible outcomes for each run of this experiment. Quantum theory predicts the probability of each of these 16 outcomes. Just imagine that each particle of the produced pair is given, at the moment of production, instructions which determine which of the four possible outcomes of the POV measurement to be performed on it is to be realized, and that the particles then carry the instructions to the measurement regions. (Compare the discussion in [4].) This is clearly a local model, and if the pairs of instructions are chosen with frequencies which agree with the quantum probabilities, the quantum predictions will be obeyed. Hence a local model could agree with the quantum predictions (and so could violate the inequality (1)) for this experiment. Therefore an experiment of the type suggested by Cabello should not be considered to be a test of locality.

Acknowledgement: I would like to acknowledge conversations with Henry Stapp, as well as the hospitality of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, where this work was done.

References

- [1] J. S. Bell, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1960).
- [2] A. Cabello, “Bell’s inequality without alternative settings,” *quant-ph/0210081*.
- [3] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880 (1969).
- [4] N. D. Mermin, *Physics Today* **38**, April 1985, p. 38.